REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1, 7, 11, 12, 15, 18, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Nohno et al., claims 4, 5, 6 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nohno et al. in view of Teterwak, claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nohno et al. in view of Gettemy et al., claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nohno et al. in view of Cees Van Berkel, and claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nohno et al. in view of Cees Van Berkel and further in view of Gettemy.

As disclosed in the instant specification, the gist of the invention is to provide a touch control display screen in which a built-in **electromagnetic induction layer formed by a wire lattice** is manufactured as a position sensing device for input methods such as touching and pointing. Accordingly, **the wire lattice is formed by wires winded along X-axis and Y-axis. The winded wires in the two different directions are interlaced separately and provided with respective reference positions.** The electromagnetic induction layer formed by winded wires is easy to manufacture, low cost and preferred for a greater surface area.

Nohno et al. disclose a coordinate input device capable of directly detecting **electrostatic coupling capacitance** with high accuracy. The input device has a tablet including **first electrodes** parallel to one another at specified intervals, and **second electrodes** arranged parallel to one another at specified intervals, but in a direction crossing the direction of the first electrodes (col. 4, lines 30-35). According to the above

construction, the selected electrode of **the tablet is *grounded via a finger or pen*** serving as a coordinate designating conductor and a human body, while a **DC voltage generating means for generating a DC power voltage is *grounded via an electrical outlet*** or the like. With this arrangement, **a current of an intensity corresponding to the *electrostatic coupling capacitance* between the selected electrodes and the coordinate designating conductor** flows through the selected electrodes (col. 4, lines 55-65).

Applicant respectfully points out from the above excerption of Nohno et al. that there is absolutely no teaching of ***an electromagnetic induction layer*** formed by a wire lattice of the instant invention in the cited prior art. **The winded wires**, which are the basis of **providing electromagnetic induction**, forming the wire lattice are completely different from the **electrodes** of Nohno et al. which rely on **being *grounded via a finger or pen for detecting electrostatic coupling capacitance*** to function properly. It is evident that the cited prior art and the instant invention differ significantly both in the physical structures and the working principle. Nohno et al. not only do not describe or patent the subject matter of the instant invention but also teach away from the instant invention.

In the detailed office action, the examiner cited the array of electrodes S1, …, SN and G1, …, GM of Nohno et al. under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being readable on the induction layer which is a wire lattice winded and interlaced separately by wires along X and Y axes. Applicant respectfully contends that the rejection is unwarranted because the citation is groundless. As discussed above, there is absolutely no teaching of winded wires in the art of Nohno et al. **The electrodes are not winded wires**. Furthermore, the detection of ***electrostatic coupling capacitance*** for grounded electrodes is by no means

an **electromagnetic induction**. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection should be withdrawn.

In response to the office action, claim 1 is now amended to correct informalities and to clearly define the subject matter of the invention in a patentable way. From the foregoing analysis and comparison, the amended claim 1 should be allowable over Nohno et al. under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) because Nohno et al. neither describe nor patent the instant invention as recited in claim 1. In the above amendment, claims 4-7, 11-12, and 15-23 are amended to correct a few informalities and indefiniteness including those pointed out by the examiner. By virtue of dependency to claim 1, the amended claims 4-7, 11-12 and 15-23 should also be allowable.

From the foregoing discussion, it is clear that the instant invention differs from the cited prior arts. The physical difference results in different effects and is not obvious. The amended claims 1, 4-7, 11-12 and 15-23 are in full condition for allowance. Drawing Figs. 9-10 are amended to correct a couple of reference numbers so as to be consistent with other figures. A replacement sheet for Figs. 9-10 is submitted for approval. The specification has also been amended to correct a few editorial and grammatical errors. Prompt and favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jason Z. Lin/
Jason Z. Lin
Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 37,492
(408) 627-4082